DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 539 EA 023 022

AUTHOR Amey, Marilyn J.
TITLE Constructive/Development Theory and Leadership: A Question of Perceived Leadership.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Effectiveness; *Cognitive Development; Global Approach; Higher Education; *Models; *Organizational Theories
IDENTIFIERS Conceptual Frameworks; *Developmental Theory; *Leadership Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

This paper summarizes a project to determine the helpfulness of constructive/developmental theory in studying effective leadership. Grounded in social science research conducted by Piaget, Kohlberg, Perry, and others, the constructive/developmental leadership model has four stages. In the imperial stage, the individual's frames of reference are personal goals and agendas. At the interpersonal stage, individuals can reflect on others' interests and experience trust, commitment, and mutuality. Persons in the institutional stage have developed a subjective frame of reference allowing for self-definition in terms of internal values and standards, not merely connections to others. In the interindividual stage, end values have become the object and a "global" worldview becomes the organizing process. The constructive/developmental model was used to analyze transcripts from interviews across five institutional settings (small, private liberal arts colleges) to determine the leader's developmental level, the organization's developmental level, and the leader's perceived effectiveness. Regarding the relationship of effective leadership to leader/constituent developmental congruence, results confirm that constituents can only perceive leadership effectiveness within a particular frame of reference determined by their cognitive development level. Similarly, a leader will only be able to enact leadership within his/her particular frame of reference, again a function of cognitive development. Leaders who are more cognitively developed than the organization can also be perceived as ineffective if they are not employing appropriate leadership strategies based on their constituents' development. (21 references) (MLH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED338539

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Amey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Constructive/Development Theory and Leadership: A Question of Perceived Leadership

Marilyn J. Amey
Assistant Professor of Higher Education

University of Kansas

Prepared for the Annual Meeting
American Educational Research Association
Chicago, Illinois
April, 1991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

E4023022

Constructive/Developmental Theory and Leadership: A Question of Perceived Effectiveness

The purpose of this study was to determine if utilizing a constructive/developmental theory would be helpful in studying effective leadership. The study specifically focused on two research questions: 1) is effective leadership related to leader and organizational developmental congruence? and 2) is constructive/developmental theory useful to leaders in assessing their environments and determining effective leadership behaviors and strategies?

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

After a lengthy study of collegiate presidents, Bensimon, Neumann and Birnbaum come to the "conclusion" that the difference between effective and ineffective leaders may be related to cognitive complexity (Bensimon et al., 1989). They indicate that effective leaders have the ability to use multiple lenses to analyze and address problems instead of approaching each problem from a single perspective. The authors go on to say that the ability to use several frames (lenses) may "reflect a high level of cognitive differentiation and integration" (p. 72). As a result of this higher level of cognitive complexity, the leader is able to create and present alternative organizational realities and to provide different interpretations of events. Conversely, those leaders who are less effective according to Bensimon et al., and we can infer who are less cognitively complex thinkers, are likely to have a simpler understanding of their institutions and their leadership role. As leaders have been described as "managers of meaning" for their organizations (Smircich and Morgan, 1982), it seems important to understand the processes by which the leaders create meaning out of their experiences thereby adding to our knowledge of how leaders interpret and enact their leadership role.

The bases for the constructive/developmental perspective on leadership come originally from social science research conducted by Piaget, Kohlberg, Perry, and Kegan, among others. This collective of cognitive development theorists proposed an "information processing" view of individual growth through which development was seen as an increasing differentiation and

integration of external stimuli. An individual selectively attends to external stimuli, imposes some kind of "meaningful order" to the stimuli, and then develops and uses principles or rules to guide behavior, make decisions, and solve problems (Kegan, 1982; Kohlberg, 1971; Perry, 1970; Piaget, 1964; Rodgers, 1980; Smith, 1978). The emphasis of this theoretical perspective is on how an individual will perceive, organize, and evaluate experiences and events in his/her life...in more popular terminology, how an individual makes meaning. Because this approach encompasses one's total way of thinking, not just an attitude toward something, the theorists believe that cognitive structure can be inferred from patterns of behavior, particularly those reflecting thought processes, and thereby can be assessed and attended to by researchers and/or the individual. According to this perspective, however, events and situations do not exist, nor can they be understood or acted upon by the individual until they have been experienced and constructed internally (Kegan, 1982). At this point, in progression from one developmental stage to the next, what was formerly subject [the structure/perceptions/lens by which experience is organized] becomes object [the content of a new organizing process].

The constructive/developmental theory of leadership, as posited and utilized by Kegan and Lahey (1984) and Kuhnert and Lewis (1987), suggests that leaders vary in the ways in which they subjectively construct and organize experiences about themselves, their social and interpersonal environments, and formal organizations. Kegan and Lahey (1984) suggest that leaders at different developmental levels use different systems for constructing reality, and may incorporate different approaches to leadership issues and problems. In advancing the theory's applicability for studying leadership, Kuhnert and Lewis (1987) posit that constructive/developmental theory can provide a framework for specifically understanding the processes through which transformational and transactional leaders emerge. Transactional leaders are defined as those engaged with followers in relationships of mutual dependence based upon reciprocal exchanges of value to each side (Kellerman, 1984; Yukl, 1981). Two levels of transactional leadership presumably exist: one based on lower-order exchanges of concrete resources and extrinsic rewards [e.g., pay increases, special benefits), and the other derived from higher-order transactions of non-concrete, intrinsic

rewards (e.g., trust, commitment, respect] (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). The definition of transformational leadership employed by Kuhnert and Lewis is based on the research of Burns and Bass and originates in the personal values and beliefs of the leader. End values (Burns, 1978) such as justice, equality, and integrity are central to the leader's ability to unite and motivate followers, and to change (transform) followers' beliefs, goals, and values to a higher level of morality. Kuhnert and Lewis argue that the organizational and perceptual structures of transactional leaders are quite distinct from those of transformational leaders, and that both sets of structures can be meaningfully assessed via constructive/developmental theory.

Yet, the question of leadership effectiveness seems to rest not only on the leader's understanding of reality as often proposed by traditional leadership theorists, including those mentioned above. But rather, if leadership effectiveness is in fact reliant upon shared values, shared language, and shared meaning as suggested by Heider (1989), Kelley (1989), Morgan (1986) among others, then the perceptions and cognitive complexity of constituents must also be considered. As Hollander (1987) purports, the leader's latitude to bring about change is a function of constituent perceptions, understandings, attitudes, and willingness to change. Therefore, an expanded application of constructive/developmental theory would suggest that the way in which the organization [constituents] constructs meaning is not only affected by the leader but a critical determinant of leader effectiveness. In the conclusion of their theoretical discussion of constructive/developmental theory, Kuhnert and Lewis reinforce this perspective by questioning the affect on leadership effectiveness when leaders and followers operate at different developmental levels, suggesting that "cognitive fit" may be the significant determiner of leadership success or failure.

Building on the work of Kuhnert and Lewis, Kegan, and Kegan and Lahey, a modified constructive/developmental model of leadership [hereto referred to without the modifier] was developed to analyze the relationship between effective leadership and leader/organizational developmental congruence. Rather than relying solely on the constructs of transformational and transactional leadership as traditionally defined, the model incorporates the language and

definitions used by Bensimon (1989), including trans-vigorational leadership as a more relevant and reflective approach to effective leadership in the 1990s. Trans-vigorational leadership is presented as one in which the leader is willing to learn the organizational culture as it currently exists and can create a vision for improving it. The leader attempts to invigorate the organization rather than maintaining the status quo (traditional transactional) or creating holistic change (traditional transformational). It should be noted that, similar to the original constructive/ developmental research, the theory presented in this paper is a general human learning theory being applied to the study of leadership. This means that the same theory could be used to assess cognitive development of leaders and constituents as well.

The constructive/developmental model of leadership has four relevant stages (one more than the version proposed by Kuhnert and Lewis, although Kegan's original research essentially had six developmental stages). Table 1 below presents the model, with a discussion of the stages and their implications for leadership.

Stage 2: Imperial

In Stage 2, the individual's frames of reference (subject) are personal goals and agendas. Everything is experienced and evaluated in these terms. For example, a leader in Stage 2 would view followers as advancing or thwarting his/her personal goals and aspirations. Because they are enmeshed in this organizing process, persons at this level assume, often incorrectly, that others operate from the same frames of reference. As a result, low-level transactions are not only what seems appropriate in this stage [you give me what I want, I 'll give you what you want as long as it doesn't negatively impact me], but what are cognitively possible. Individuals may say that they aspire to higher level objects such as team spirit or mutual respect, but they haven't developed the organizing process (frame of reference/subject) for understanding and participating in mutually beneficial experiences or shared perceptions. From a constructive/developmental perspective, persons in this stage lack an ability to reflect on goals. They do not have agendas; they are their

agendas. For instance, one whose personal goal is becoming the leader does not see beyond that goal to the consequences for or needs of the organization.

Although leaders in Stage 2 are the least cognitively developed leaders according to the theory, they may still be effective when organizational goals have already been clearly defined, perhaps as in a rigid bureaucracy, and when rewards are controlled by the leader so that low-level transactions may be perpetuated. Stage 2 leaders might also be seen as effective if others in the organization are in Stage 1 (the Impulsive Stage), where the frame of reference is very childlike, the motivation is purely self-gain and avoiding punishment, and the relationship to the leader is expected to be similar to that of parent/child.

TABLE 1
Modified Constructive/Developmental Model of Leadership

Stage	Subject (Organizing Process)	Object (Content of Experience)
2 Imperial (Lower-Order Transactional)	Personal Goals and agendas	Perceptions, immediate needs, feelings
3 Interpersonal (Higher-Order Transactional)	Interpersonal connections mutual obligations	Personal goals and agendas
4 Institutional (Trans-vigorational)	Personal standards and value system	Interpersonal connections, mutual obligations
5 Interindividual (Transformational)	Collective definitions interpenetration of systems	Personal standards and value systems

* Stage 1 was omitted from the table because the theorists suggest that an individual would not be able to be at this developmental stage and hold a leadership position. Stage labels come directly from Kegan's original constructive/development research (1982).

Stage 3: Interpersonal

At this stage, individuals can reflect on their own interests as well as those of others. They can experience trust, commitment, respect and mutuality, and participate in mutually beneficial transactions i.e., promises, expectations, obligations, and rewards. Connectedness is important and one might sacrifice personal goals in order to maintain connections with others. Those in leadership positions relinquish the need to constantly monitor and reward followers' performance because they recognize and understand the value of maintaining a certain level of personal regard instead of a primary focus on concrete payoffs. Communicating attitudes becomes the critical leadership task in this stage with the awareness that followers' sense of and adherence to these attitudes are what maintain work levels and commitment. Although these higher-order transactions are productive, they are not without shortcomings for the leader. For instance, the leader in Stage 3 values commitment and loyalty but is also bound by them as a frame of reference, unable to have a perspective on or move beyond them. This can be especially problematic when loyalties conflict, such as when loyalty to follower is in conflict with loyalty to the organization. Theoretically, there is no perspective from which to solve the dilemma, as the leader's loyalties are the organizing process; the only acceptable response is one that would maintain fairness to all parties...an option that might not exist in reality.

The importance of connectedness in Stage 3 is an initial component of transformational leadership, in that the leader can motivate followers beyond the realm of concrete rewards. Maintaining the respect of the leader is important to followers at this stage, and yet this may be accomplished without follower goals and beliefs having substantially changed (another important component of transformational leadership). In this stage, the leader is also equally dependent on the shared sense of mutual respect and will work to maintain connectedness. Therefore, Stage 3 still represents a transactional relationship between leader and follower, although the "what" and "why" of transactions may have become higher order. In an effort to maintain the relationship, the leader must continue the transactions, leading at some point to the inability to fulfill promises to all concerned and the potential breakdown of the relationship.

Stage 4: Institutional

Persons in Stage 4 have developed a subjective frame of reference that allows for self-definition not in terms of connections to others, as in Stage 3, but rather in terms of internal values and standards (preliminary evidence of Burns' end goals). Individuals are able to take an objective view of goals and commitments and they operate from a personal value system that transcends their agendas and loyalties. They are cognitively able to know the limitations and strengths of different viewpoints. Because they can take a perspective on interpersonal relationships, individuals at this stage are able to resolve conflicts based on a set of internal standards. They achieve a self-determined sense of identity and purpose, and as a result as leaders are able to integrate their ideas and values into the work group. The leader's enabling of others to adopt, accept and internalize end values is what Kuhnert and Lewis consider transformational leadership.

From a theoretical grounding, however, unless the leader has experienced and internally constructed the frame of reference (subject) thereby making it the content of experience (object), she or he is unable to fully incorporate and utilize the aspects of transformational leadership implied in Stage 4. Embedded in the personal standards characteristic of the subject in Stage 4, the leader has no perspective on them so would not fully be able to reconcile dissonance or convert others to accept these standards except by example. According to cognitive development theorists (Kegan included), the integration of subject to object would not become fully part of cognition until the individual is either **in** transition to the next stage or has **completed** the transition. Therefore, in a purist sense, a leader in Stage 4 might indeed be transformational as perceived by others but not as a result of an act of leader cognition.

Stage 5: Interindividual

The constructive/developmental theory of leadership presented here includes a fifth stage similar to Kegan's original research, called the interindividual stage, in which end values have become the object and a "global" worldview becomes the organizing process. The cognitive

complexity of Kegan's fifth stage was reached by the rare individual who was capable of envisioning and incorporating end values into a collective reality through the conversion of others. As with the traditional definition of transformational leadership, interindividual leaders may more appropriately be associated with social and religious movements than formal organizations so in many ways may be less relevant to this discussion. However, the recognition of a theoretically-based Stage 5 allows for the reshaping of Stage 4 in the Kuhnert and Lewis model to reflect what is an appropriate leadership concept - institutional leaders as trans-vigorational leaders - those who can operationalize the interpersonal values of constituents and enact the existing culture, and those who can also model and begin to articulate a vision of improvement.

An important consideration in the application of the constructive/developmental theory of leadership is the fact that although a leader may be cognitively capable of operating from a particular frame of reference, nothing guarantees that she or he will choose to do so. As Kuhnert and Lewis suggest, "[s]ometimes transformational leaders use transactional methods to lead, but [they] have the ability to understand the available leadership options and to act in the manner that is most appropriate to the situation" (p. 220). Choice of leadership style/approach/ behavior/option in large part should be determined by the cognitive complexity of constituents. The interesting research questions then become:

1) What happens when leaders and constituents operate at different cognitive levels?

2) Can a leader at one level effectively motivate others who are at a lower level? at a higher level? at the same level?

3) Are there implications in the use of constructive/developmental theory for our understandings of effective leadership?

METHOD

Using these questions as the over-arching research agenda, the constructive/developmental model of leadership was used to analyze transcripts from interviews across five institutional

settings to determine 1) the developmental level of the leader, 2) the developmental level of the organization, and 3) the perceived effectiveness of the leader.

Interview data were collected at five small, private liberal arts colleges as part of a study on academic vice presidents and institutional leadership. The purpose of the interviews was to gain information on how academic vice presidents (provosts) exhibit leadership and under what circumstances, based on the perspectives of those being interviewed. Because leadership is thought to be an interactive process between leader and constituent(s) (Amey, 1989), information needed to be gathered from the academic vice president and a variety of constituent perspectives horizontally and vertically within the institution e.g., deans, department heads, president, faculty.

The on-site interviews were scheduled over a three day period at each institution. Individual interviews lasted approximately 60 minutes a piece; the provost interview usually lasted 3-4 hours. Interview guides were developed based on relevant leadership literature and research for use during the on-site interviews which served as checklists to insure all relevant topics and subject areas were explored with each informant. Interview questions looked at academic vice presidential leadership from a variety of perspectives including those held by leadership position incumbents and their constituents. Observational settings were also included in the data gathering process, such as presidential cabinet meetings, faculty senate meetings, and provost staff meetings. Transcripts of tape recorded interview sessions and field notes for each participant were analyzed and individual institutional cases developed.

The transcripts and field notes were analyzed via the constructive/developmental model presented in this paper. The researcher examined the text for the existence of characteristics and components of each stage as evidenced by either the provost or constituents in the same vein as text analysis would be conducted using cognitive development theory. Text was coded as it reflected a given aspect within each stage; a respondent was then presumed to be at a certain constructive/ developmental stage overall if there was a preponderance of coded text reflecting one stage. Those persons categorized as in transition gave responses that fell equally within two developmental stages. It is recognized that within each institutional setting, only approximately ten persons were

interviewed, thereby limiting the generalizability of the developmental analysis. However, constituents were randomly selected within each college for participation (with the exception of the president) so their perspectives were assumed to be fairly representative.

The last part of the analysis for this paper was an attempt to determine what implications might exist, if any, for perceived leadership effectiveness as a result of having identified leader and constituent constructive/developmental stages. Although not specifically asked in the interviews, comments about leadership effectiveness were provided by every participant. The analytical question, then, was not really if the provost was perceived to be effective by his or her constituents, but why and what leadership strategies might enhance that effectiveness.

In presenting the data analysis, the researcher has attempted to include reflective and representative text from the cumulative data to illustrate the leader and constituents as they fell along each stage. In capturing the essence of the constructive/developmental model, other approaches to reporting the analysis might be equally appropriate.

DATA ANALYSIS

The results of this study fell along three points on the leader-organization developmental continuum, with developmental distinctions emerging at two of the three points. The data will be presented first as an analysis reflecting the developmental stage of the leader and the organization. As the specific constructive/developmental stage characteristics/components can be found in the previous discussion, they have not been repeated here. The analysis will then be discussed in terms of its implications for perceived leadership effectiveness and effective leadership strategies.

Leader Developmentally Below Organization

Stage 2 Leader/Stage 2-3 Organization. At the low extreme on the continuum, the leader was somewhat developmentally below the organization; in large part, the leader and the organization were working from a Stage 2 frame of reference.

For 20 years, most of the leader's adult life, the primary personal goal was to become the provost of College A. Having finally done so, he says, "it's a dream come true!" The provost's preoccupation with his personal goal does not permit him to fully recognize the implications of the role he has assumed. He is unable to separate himself from his goal enough to understand the realities of actually being provost. For instance, the provost summarizes his approach to the position by saying, "The primary function of the provost is to find ways of helping faculty do their own thing." Yet, the faculty and administration look to the provost to set an academic direction for the school. "The provost overlooks setting an academic tone. He has made speeches but [there's more to it than that];""We don't know academically what we're going to do...;" and "The institution owes the students and faculty a meaningful discussion on what we're trying to do. The [provost] should lead the discussion and provide the impetus for change," reflect common feelings of the faculty. Additional evidence of the provost's ties to his personal goals and agendas comes from his vision of the institution's future, succinctly stated, "I want it to be right where we are now." The comments and behaviors of the provost strongly suggest that he works diligently to protect, maintain and reinforce the present circumstances as central to any future direction.

In believing that his primary role is the facilitator, the "do-er" for faculty, Provost A believes he can steer clear of major conflicts that might threaten his position as provost (the preeminent personal goal). In the provost's thinking, if he can do things for the faculty, they will allow him to stay; both sides then are content. The provost does not initiate many policies or institutional agendas, although once someone else has done this, everyone agrees that the provost works very hard to accomplish the stated ends. One of his interpersonal strengths is one-on-one negotiations and he keeps himself central to dyadic conversations, exchanges and problem solving whether, by position, he needs to be involved or not. In commenting on the apparent diffuseness of the community, the provost says, "Ninety percent of my time is conflict resolution. Each department is like an individual - you act as a referee." However, by remaining so highly involved in day-to-day interactions of this kind, Provost A increases the potential for lower-order exchange opportunities which are central to his leadership strategy.

In some ways, Provost A appears to be trying to move out of Stage 2 embeddedness, attempting to see beyond immediate personal needs and towards a sense of teamwork and institutional commitment motivated by more than personal gain; in other ways, the same indicators could be reflective of his desire to avoid unnecessary conflicts which might threaten the status quo and his position. "I always try not to make the decision - try to get faculty to look in a broader context;" "The way I try to get [faculty] to work together is by coming up with alternative strategies." Some faculty and administrators are aware of the provost's struggle to develop better relationships with community members and engender more institutional support, as well. "The [provost] would be really interested in having a better relationship [with the faculty] but doesn't know how."

The organization seems to be in transition between Stage 2 and Stage 3, wanting to find some sense of institutional direction and commitment rather than being forced to rely solely on individual agendas. One faculty member relates, "The [provost] would like to think we're doing our thing and he can facilitate where need be and we would trust him. He spends his time fixing family spats instead of looking at programs and figuring out ways of adding to them." Another offers, "...[He] has the wrong perception of the faculty here. They're really committed to the institution and high education. [He] treated them like dummies..." Faculty and administrators' attempts and abilities to understand some of the conflicts which exist, their recognition of a willingness to forge together in some community beliefs, and the kinds of reflection they are able to do about the provost also support the cognitive transition taking place.

Implications for Perceived Leadership Effectiveness: For Provost A, this point on the continuum might almost be identified as pre-transactional because the leader is only able to engage in limited exchanges with constituents. He is unable to barter in meaningful ways with faculty, in part due to resource restraints but also due to a lack of understanding of what is of value to the faculty. Most faculty are unmotivated, fairly dissatisfied, and not hopeful for the future under Provost A. Although there is limited suggestion of the desire for some higher-order transactions, the data do not reflect the leader's ability to engage in those exchanges successfully, in large part

because he perceives any degree of dissonance as a threat to, rather than a part of, his personal goal of being the provost at College A. There is no evidence of mutual influence between the leader and constituents in large part because there is little feeling or discussion of shared values (which would likely be the case if one or both are embedded in personal goals and agendas). Comments made almost universally by members of the organization reflect the struggle to move into an institutional definition of self without the presence of a leader who is able to help them do that in the person of the provost. As a result, in most circumstances, the leader is perceived to be ineffective.

Leader and Organization Developmentally the Same

The second point on the continuum contains those leaders who are at basically the same constructive/developmental stage as their organization. Depending on the specific level of congruent development, the leader may be employing transactional and/or trans-vigorational behaviors. In both cases, there is evidence of mutual respect and influence and leaders are seen as effective. The developmental model would suggest, however, that a leader and organization who are in the interpersonal developmental stage may experience significant dissonance as they attempt to grow together in that they may be unable to deal with conflicting loyalties and competing agendas forced upon them by environmental pressures.

Stage 3 Leader/Stage 3 Organization In attempting to work through the balancing act between personal needs and the agendas of others, Provost B has found it necessary to modify his own perspectives in order to function within this setting. In recounting his outlook on the position, he says "[i]t's manageable if you change your perception of how you can be a chief academic officer. At [College B] when you're provost, everything else comes at you in lieu of other things most traditionally a part of the CAO...I have to delegate things...I'd rather do...It's a difference in the definition of chief academic officer." As one faculty member characterizes the tightrope, "He can be a facilitator but he has to be willing to lead in a subtle way - letting others take credit - celebrate others doing things." An administrator offers, "The most difficult thing for

the provost here now and in the future is to shape the academic program in anyway that might seem threatening to the faculty and any change is threatening...He won't be able to do it without drawing faculty in..." As the provost recounts, "This is not a place for a leader to stand up and take charge...The more effective I'll be, the more I'll work with the system and not have the system work me...."

Because consensus (or the appearance of it) is so highly valued in this stage and at this institution, the provost is often called upon to counsel those who may be on the fringe back into the fold. Constituents rely on the provost's having developed strong interpersonal relationships in order to be able to accomplish this function. Given the general criticisms of administrators proferred by faculty at College B, they are quite complementary of the provost and his reinforcement of shared attitudes. The following constituent comments reflect the provost's position within the organization and this developmental stage: "In most instances, the provost is an effective faculty spokesperson;" "[He] is pretty straightforward;" "He has gained people's respect. It's hard for an outsider to come in and develop relationships and trust. It doesn't happen because of the position...you have to earn it;" "[The provost] handles himself in a way that proves he has a lot of integrity. People trust him. He has been sensitive to the climate here - hasn't tried to impose his own agendas without considering the views of others."

In this particular institution, the faculty have a long history of very strong governance. As a result of this element of the social architecture, faculty already share many of the relationships and values important to this constructive/developmental stage. In some ways, it may seem that the organization is operating at the Institutional Stage (4), but in reality, they are embedded in the interpersonal obligations and commitments of Stage 3. This is evidenced in the description of institution-wide faculty meetings, identified by all as the pinnacle of the decision making process: "The faculty meeting is like a town meeting - we're all there. A positive side of the faculty governance structure is the sense of ownership - most faculty do try to do their part contributing to the university, shaping policy, making academic decisions. It gives us the power to make decisions without responsibility...." While the objective discussion of the governance structure

suggests transition to Stage 4, the unwillingness to take responsibility for relationships is a vestige of Stage 3. Another example of the organization struggling with transition is found in that the faculty feel the provost needs to have a vision for the organization yet they are quick to add, "It's a political role because he has no real power. He has to work with faculty committees. He can't push faculty."

Transaction, albeit higher order, is still central to the relationships at College B, and as a consequence, to the leadership strategies most useful to Provost B, instead of a larger shared vision of improvement which might be present in Stage 4. There is some evidence that the provost may be wrestling with transition to Stage 4 and with how he might facilitate the transition of others. He articulates one of his greatest challenges to be moving the faculty, as a group, into what he calls "growth mode behavior," but adds that a major obstacle rests with the strong governance structure. "This may not be a place amenable to qualitative change. The system is prohibitive to change. Also, faculty probably view growth differently than me. For them it may be increased FTEs, resources. For me, it's moving in new directions, being open to ideas...We are trying to be a vehicle for making things different, for taking risks." There is less evidence that faculty are ready for the transition; they still seem embedded in maintaining their connectedness especially via the governance structure with little understanding of the consequences for the institution as a whole. The following constituent comments speak to this cognitive dilemma: "It's nearly impossible for a provost here [to create change];" "The successful administrators here are those who go through the faculty process and don't complain about it. The governance structure could be the source of the great turnover in the CAO position;" and "The problem with the question [of a leadership role] is given our structure, what is leadership? If you were to say has [he] worked within the system to achieve what is achievable, then [there is a role]."

Implications for Perceived Leadership Effectiveness: As long as the provost is able to maintain the balance between individual and institutional needs and relationships, he is seen as effective. Right now, constituents are pleased with his performance and his role as a "good team player." The drawback is that this equilibrium is not only extremely draining to perpetuate but also

not an entirely healthy stance for the institution. As the provost cognitively works through his own developmental transition (which may or may not be able to occur in this environment), his motivation to continually reinforce interpersonal relationships at the exclusion of internal standards should wane, causing perceived ineffectiveness if the constituents will not be budged from their embeddedness in Stage 3. There are already emotional and physical signs that the provost is tiring of the responsibility for maintaining higher and lower-order transactions on such a personal basis.

The leadership challenge to the provost is that of facilitating the change of constituent beliefs and goals, and their subsequent internalization. Yet until he has internally constructed these new goals himself, he is likely to be only marginally successful at enacting the process with others. The likelihood is that, if the press of the position and environment remains the same, burnout will occur and the provost will voluntarily (or involuntarily) leave the leadership position at College B before organizational transition to Stage 4 has occurred.

Stage 4 Leader/Stage 3-4 Organization. Provost C operates primarily from the perspective of a set of internal standards and values, and sets the institutional well-being ahead of interpersonal relationships and connectedness. He says, "I have a sense of my own future, my own possibilities - small "v" vision - not someone who is always dreaming dreams which don't necessarily bear a close relationship to institutional reality." For instance, he highly values the standards of objectivity and integrity in his role and personal character. In describing his role in faculty governance and decision making, Provost C says,

> "Under the bylaws, faculty make decisions about academic and student life. I'm the intermediary. I try very hard not to influence the process...The greatest service I can provide them is to depoliticize the role [of provost] since I'm not really part of the process of policy formulation. A neutral chair is really important. I listen to the group in order to make informed decisions."

Others are quick to agree with the provost's standards: "He has absolute integrity - he wouldn't promise something he can't deliver;" "My relationship with the provost is built on basic honesty;" "[He] is fair - I find him very fair."

As to the priority of institutional well-being, faculty and staff make regular reference to the provost's sense of direction for College C and for the most part, share it. Says one, "The provost...[has] a real idea of where [he] wants the [college] to go. In the late 1970s, they made the choice to go for academic quality." This sense of academic excellence is articulated throughout the organization, from the dean of admissions who indicates a primary goal as "becoming more selective in admissions standards," to the faculty member who says "the college is not the same as it was ten years ago. It's a hell of a lot better quality." Most at College C associate the pursuit of academic excellence with the provost. "He's motivated by his commitment to our academic program above all else," says one faculty member. They feel comfortable with his articulated institutional direction even if they do not always agree on every point.

The community seems to fluctuate between constructive/developmental Stages 3 and 4. They often get frustrated with the provost when he "violates" some important interpersonal relationship or aspect, yet will quickly add that one of the characteristics they value most in the provost is his integrity. A scenario which illustrates the provost's having moved beyond the faculty in terms of interpersonal relationships as a frame of reference is told through the aftermath of one particular faculty meeting on curricular change. In the words of the faculty, the content and tenor of the meeting was "...tearing us apart as a faculty;" "This is awful - out of hand - we don't know how to fix it;" and the meeting was generally considered to be "the most divisive faculty meeting in the last twenty years." On the other hand, the provost, not bound by a choice between competing loyalties in the same way as the faculty, views even devisive discussions as central to the intellectual process of change, which is critical in faculty governance. Rationally, he says "the catastrophic language [of the faculty] may have been overstated" and does not view the interaction as having jeopardized faculty relationships, values or beliefs. Though he is cognizant of the emotional underpinnings that can be associated with change or conflicting values, his behaviors do not always convey enough empathy or sympathy to faculty (who have not divorced themselves from some aspects of Stage 3) to convince them to quickly follow him through volatile situations. As some faculty suggest, "[His] rigidity affects ways in which people react;" "We need good

strokes;" and, "He's a good provost...He's not good at telling people he appreciates them. He does publicly sometimes when he thinks he should." This perceived over-intellectualism/lack of interpersonalness, which in part may be the product of transition to Stage 4 thinking, impedes the provost's ability to encourage others to adopt his values and standards.

While not to negate the importance of the provost being sensitive to the cognitive complexity of constituents, there is also evidence that he is succeeding in convincing others to adopt some of his values and standards. The vision of academic quality discussed above is certainly one. Change, albeit primarily incremental, is occurring throughout the campus on a number of fronts, as the college institutionally positions itself. The provost has a healthy attitude toward conflict and change, and their inevitable presence in a thriving organization. "You're busy putting out fires for the first [few years]...The more you can address and take care of underlying problems, the more you can introduce routine and understandings...this leads to more freedom to do things that make a difference over the longhaul." He has a good sense of the difficulties of different units on particular issues and conveys that well to them departmentally and individually. As a result, rather than being overly threatened by change, one long-time faculty member expresses for many the thought that, "There's a new faculty climate - it's more enthusiastic, more dynamic - interested in change for the better rather than just complaining."

Implications for Perceived Leadership Effectiveness: Similar to the provost at College B, there is a certain balance that needs to be maintained organizationally in order for the provost to be seen as effective. For Provost C, the balance rests on the original cognitive development concern with challenge and support, and can be facilitated in large part through the use of appropriate leadership strategies. The organization seems to be in transition between the interpersonal orientation of Stage 3 and the institutional orientation of Stage 4. As a result of this transition and the conflicts inherent in cognitive growth, the provost is often seen as more effective by those who have also moved beyond the frame of reference bound by personal relationships and connections. While those still operating from this lens often convey belief in the provost's effectiveness, they are less likely to work towards cognitively internalizing his standards and values without sufficient

support for their present level of development. The provost has to recognize the needs of both groups of constituents and modify his leadership strategies appropriately. More specifically, trans-vigorational strategies and behaviors may be very effective with those constituents who have moved to Stage 4 but higher-order transactional exchanges are still necessary to keep those at Stage 3 invested, committed and growing.

Both Provost B and C face the challenge of fostering the development of others while simultaneously working through many of the same cognitive dilemmas. If development remains in tandem, it will be interesting to see how long each provost will be perceived as an effective leader in that the ability to solve problems and set direction is a function of having cognitively internalized to object what was subject. If both leader and organization are working through the same cognitive processes, who has "the answers?" Who sets the direction? Who can deal with cognitive conflicts? It almost seems as though, if the leader and organization are really at the same constructive/developmental stage, the leader will either not be seen as effective for long and/or will be relying upon some other leadership basis such as charisma. Neither Provost B or C is considered to have charisma but each does appear to be at a slightly higher developmental level than their organization. This continued cognitive "edge" may prove important to continued perceived effectiveness.

Leader Developmentally Higher than Organization

The final point on the continuum reflected in the data encompasses those leaders who are at a higher developmental level than their organization. Both cases involve institutions which have recently experienced some kind of organizational trauma: one is dealing with the loss of a long-standing, beloved president while in office, and the other has been going through serious enrollment and financial retrenchment. If the organization is embedded in a developmental stage, leaders may be seen as ineffective as they try to interact with the constituents and encourage organizational growth. While individual leaders may have different leadership strategies at their disposal, the organization still may not be developmentally ready to accept even trans-vigorational

strategies. Conversely, if the organization is in crisis, having been routed involuntarily from a given developmental stage, the leader is able to utilize various transactional, transformational and trans-vigorational behaviors at their disposal.

Stage 4 Leader/ Stage 3 Organization. One of the principle difficulties for Provost D is the incongruence in constructive developmental levels of herself and her constituents. This provost works at an institution in mourning, still consciously suffering from the death of a beloved president (over two years ago) and embedded in their relationship with him; constituents view almost every aspect of College D in terms of that lost relationship. Not only are most constituents overly invested in the subject of connectedness, but many have reverted to lower-order transactions again as a means of operationalizing their feelings of abandonment. In many ways, this embeddedness negatively affects the provost's ability to motivate and encourage institutional growth. As one faculty member explains, "...it's a very political process [to do things]. There's a lot of horse trading, job owning - like a presidential campaigning. It's difficult for someone to come from outside the institution without a natural constituency and do [things] in an overt sort of way especially when the previous [leader] had been here for years with all kinds of constituents." As another suggests, "Style is important here. We value warmth over intellectualism," and finally, "a lot of faculty may want to have a personally strong relationship with the administration. It hasn't gone well...[The current provost] is trying to promote friendlier relationships."

In having moved into Stage 4 herself and wanting to set a new agenda for the institution based on different standards, the provost has tried many different initiatives which she perceived to be in the best interests of the faculty and students. Most, however, have not gone well or been well received; in fact, the initiatives have been viewed by faculty as primarily an undermining of tradition and long-standing institutional values. For example, the provost tried to provide blocks of time in the weekly schedule for faculty to do research and other non-teaching activities. "I thought it would be advantageous and in fact got a number of faculty, particularly junior faculty, who wanted to have more rational scheduling so they could have time to do research and other

things," she says. Even though some departments already followed the approach outlined by the provost, and supported the plan, others immediately wanted to know, "what [is] the administrative agenda? So I let it subside. It would be silly to get crucified over schedules." One of the provost's suggestions that has taken hold is a reintroduction of faculty lunches once a week - perhaps the closest thing to a community gathering identified by constituents. A likely reason why this opportunity has been accepted rests in the faculty perception that the lunch serves as a community building activity - an opportunity for faculty and staff to develop and maintain interpersonal relationships.

Of the provost, and her ability to accurately assess situations and individuals, is said: "It's an advantage being bright, asking the right questions. She picks up on things quickly;" "She's pretty perceptive...she's a good judge of people. That's important in her position. She's good at identifying strengths and weaknesses in others, identifying issues." The provost can make the hard decisions, listens well and considers both sides. Many appreciate this; others perceive her approach as being reticent. In relaying her approach to conflict resolution and role as institutional translator, Provost D looks to a higher-order transaction of mutual respect and an invigorating vision. "[I relate] the needs and aspirations of one part that need to be translated to other parts of the institution who may talk a different language. You need to make groups feel a part of the solution rather than part of the problem. That's how to deal with factions, for different parts of the institution to work together." The provost feels that in professional interactions she is able to keep her emotional reactions in check and, in fact, sees this as a strength in this environment. On the other hand, many faculty see her as very cool and removed. She recounts with some surprise, "...I have heard that come back to me...'I was some tough cookie' and I hadn't really thought of myself as doing that." The difference in perception is important to the provost's ability to encourage growth and to be seen as effective.

Implications for Perceived Leadership Effectiveness: Similar to the implications for perceived leadership effectiveness facing Provost C, those embedded in the interpersonal relationship of Stage 3 do not see Provost D as an effective leader. To them, she is distant, too

intellectual, not overt enough in her approaches, and has not been able to engage in the kind of transactions in which the group is interested. In some ways it is evident that the provost understands the cognitive responses of these members of the community (e.g., "There are things I know I could do to appease them"). In other ways, she seems unwilling to take a step back from her own cognitive perspective and recognize the kind of leadership strategies that would be most useful in unleashing the community from its embeddedness. The provost operates more as if, by generating enough good ideas and visions of an invigorated future, she can push others along rather than realizing that a wide range of leadership alternatives will be required before constituents are fully cognitively ready for the transition into Stage 4.

Stage 4 Leader/Stage 3-4 Organization in Crisis. Given the declining institutional health over the last several years and the pending retirement of an entrenched president, the constituents of College E most wanted two things from their provost when she was hired: a vision and the ability to make it happen...despite the president. Although they feel they got what they were looking for, the process of institutional regeneration has not been easy.

One consistent comment made about and by the provost at College E is the need for someone in her position to "wrestle power from the president, confront him, tell him to butt out, and be a strong counterforce to the president." Although this might present itself as the instigation of an antagonist relationship between president and provost, one senior administrator insists, "The president learned early on that [his style] wasn't going to work with [her]. It's been hard for him to let go. When the lines are drawn she usually wins. It was what we needed when she was hired." Others suggest, "Different types of tasks require different types of leadership. She's a good leader for the tasks at hand." The provost has predominantly moved out of the frame of reference where interpersonal relationships are the focus; although they wanted a strong provost, many of her constituents are not prepared for a provost who is extremely straightforward, willing to voice opinions and reactions, and who does not see these behaviors as jeopardizing connectedness. Provost E is often seen as hardheaded and tough, and some wonder that though

she may be passionate, she may not be compassionate. As support for the existence of connectedness as the object of experience in the provost's mind, she comments on her own vulnerability, saying "I still suffer when I have to do something I don't like to do. I still bleed. I see that as a plus. There are those who are proud they're tough - I don't think that's effective as an [academic] administrator."

The second important component required of the provost when she was hired was a sense of vision. Although constituents didn't know what the institutional vision should be, they knew they needed one. In the words of several:

> "She sees a need for a vision. She also has a vision. Those aren't the same thing. She doesn't impose her vision on you - doesn't try to whip you to it. She tries to be strong while getting you to articulate what you want and works it in with hers so we get there together, so we want to arrive there;"

"The leadership [to turn the institution around] wasn't there before. The idea wasn't there." The provost is able to keep issues at the forefront, rephrasing and reexplaining until she's sure they have sunk in. One member comments, "She keeps coming back to the same issues. Keeps the same things on the agenda until you get there." "Ten years ago she might never have been hired. We might not have been ready for her."

As the provost describes her style and philosophy of decision making:

> "My preferred method is to identify the issue. I bring it to a level of consciousness - then they [faculty] take it over. Faculty don't like it when administrators make initiatives - yet they won't take the initiative...I'd prefer participative decision making. I attempt to create consensus around issues, put out ideas to be shot at."

That she elicits opinions regularly, raises issues and provides fora for discussions helps others feel comfortable with her position on issues. Constituents feel the provost is willing to make the "hard decisions" and stand behind them. "She bites the bullet and can admit she's wrong;" "She's willing to make decisions and willing to back you if there's a position that needs to be taken. She doesn't promise all things to all people because you can't deliver on that. I can count on her;" "She has a huge tolerance for cognitive dissonance and I don't."

In many ways, the community at College E seems "spread all over" the constructive/ developmental map. Some members are at least in transition to Stage 4, if not there already, as

they identify the need for institutional mission, vision, and unifying forces above the goals and agendas of individuals. Others are less certain of the renewal process, yet seem to have a sense of hope for the future as reflected in this assessment: "We're in the middle of [the process]. Seem to be going around and around - like an elephant, we don't know what to call it [ourselves]. We have to decide what we expect...I think we're making a start. It's a good process for F to go through." Still others are focused on interpersonal relationships which have eroded over the recent hard times. In response, Provost F revived the Faculty Forum, which serves as a means of intellectual stimulation and socialization. For the Provost, the forum is a "reaffirmation ceremony" for working on "reaffirming our common purpose through meetings, gatherings." For many constituents in Stage 3, the Forum is for "socializing;" "It's a small campus but we don't see faculty on other parts of the campus. The Forum gets us out." There is even a small contingent of faculty at College E who were only interested in lower-order transactions, particularly those to do with salaries and resources, and who would not participate in any forward-thinking until basic needs were addressed. In response, given the financial constraints of retrenchment, small salary increments were provided early on and some long needed equipment dollars were found as a means of satisfying these fundamental needs and gaining momentum for future higher-order exchanges. The slow change in attitude, and perhaps cognitive growth, comes from one faculty member who had regressed into Stage 2: "Faculty are in a better mood now. [We] have been in a bad mood because of poor salaries. The first raise in a while just came through. You now have the perception that somebody's concerned about this and trying to do something."

Implications for Perceived Effective Leadership: As Provost E says, "As I am successful in empowering others, my leadership role will become less obvious." Although not everyone in the environment is operating at the same cognitive level, the organization as a whole seems to be developing during this provost's tenure - or at least becoming un-stuck. She is using a trans-vigorational approach to leadership, and perhaps in some areas, moving towards the transformational as others internalize higher standards and values. Her ability to recognize the cognitive levels of constituents will be important to Provost E's continued leadership effectiveness,

especially if resources continue to be constrained. Although the institutional crisis may not be over, the appropriate use of leadership strategies may allow the provost to work with the problems through a supportive faculty and administrative team.

DISCUSSION

This study looked specifically to address two related questions in respect to the use of a constructive/developmental model for studying effective leadership. One question was whether effective leadership was related to leader/constituent developmental congruence. If one believes the argument that leadership (effective or otherwise) is bestowed in some measure by constituents, then a cognitive relationship has in one sense been established. What is added or confirmed by application of the constructive/developmental model is that constituents will only be able to perceive leadership within a particular frame of reference determined by the level of their cognitive development. For example, Stage 2 organizations are interested in lower-order transactions and motived by self-gain. Effective leadership in this organization will be that which addresses these needs and is engaged in these transactions. A leader at a higher developmental level who sees the need for transformational leadership is likely to be perceived as ineffective by the organization if such strategies are employed. This is as much, if not more, a function of the constituents' ability to understand, accept, and participate in a different (more developed) frame of reference than the leader's ability to communicate a vision. The latter, as a characteristic of leadership, has been the focus of much previous research on effective leadership; the former may be a more enlightening perspective for future research.

Similar to what was confirmed for constituents, the study has shown that a leader will only be able to enact leadership within his or her particular frame of reference, again a function of cognitive development. Stage 2 leaders, regardless of the needs of the organization, only have lower-order transactional leadership strategies within their repertoire because they have not yet made personal goals and agendas the object of their experience. As a result, these leaders do not see organizational goals, interpersonal connections, and group values as important needs to be

addressed by or part of effective leadership behaviors/strategies. If the organization has identified institutional vision as a priority, a Stage 2 administrator will not be able to provide leadership towards this end, unless there is a direct link to personal goals, and will likely be perceived as ineffective in meeting the needs of the organization.

Leaders who are more cognitively developed than the organization can also be perceived as ineffective if they are not employing appropriate leadership strategies based on their constituents' development as discussed above. Making an appropriate match between supportive and challenging leadership behavior is the key to organizational growth in a similar way that challenge and support were originally defined as central tenets of cognitive development. Having and articulating a vision are not enough to ensure the perception of effective leadership; the leader needs to be able to communicate the vision in ways which can be understood by constituents - whether that means through lower-order exchanges or trans-vigorational approaches. Determining the appropriate leadership response based on the cognitive development of constituents, therefore, may be a key to perceived leadership effectiveness. In this way, the application of the constructive/ developmental model can be useful to leaders in assessing their environments and determining effective leadership behaviors and strategies, which was the second major research question guiding this study.

In many ways, the insights provided by this study sound similar to research which has emphasized the role of culture in leadership effectiveness and perhaps even to that which falls under the rubric of situational (contingency) leadership research. The author would agree with the alignment of constructive/development theory and culture, if the emphasis is placed on culture as a function of cognition. An effective leader is framed in the context of the culture as it exists and as the leader works to enact, and eventually change, it. Similarly, an effective leader is framed in the subject of cognition as it is constructed by constituents and as the leader works to enable, and eventually stimulate, development. The focus of both the cultural and situational perspectives, however, seems most to lie with the constituents as "organizational entities" that, once understood from one perspective or another, can be changed by the leader: use initiating behaviors at one

point, consideration behaviors at another, transactional behaviors for incremental change, transformational behaviors for revolutionary change, etc. [Of course, this is an over-simplification of the theories themselves, but the underlying premises remain basically intact.] The assumption is that the leader is capable of applying whatever approach is necessary to meet the needs of constituents or that, once understood, the leader has the ability to work with and change the organizational members and their culture.

Although the constructive/developmental theory also posits that constituents can be understood and helped to develop, what is added by applying this theory is why some leaders are effective and others are not: the fact that perceived leadership effectiveness is a product of a cognitive relationship between leader and follower for which **both** must be ready. Not all constituents are cognitively ready to be led, to develop, or to grasp a sense of institutional and collective direction, regardless of whether they face growth or decline according to the usual set of organizational indicators. Similarly, not every leader is cognitively able to respond in appropriate ways to meet the needs of constituents - not simply because they lack charisma or are not nice, able individuals. Leadership effectiveness, defined as being able to understand what is of value to an organization, how to orchestrate change, and motivate and empower others, is more than a function of time spent in an environment. It is a product of collective meaning making - of constituents' ability to make meaning for themselves, of leaders' ability to make meaning for constituents, and of leaders' ability to make meaning for themselves. Each of the component parts is important to the equation of effective leadership and constructive/developmental theory illuminates each part.

A brief example of the importance of considering leadership effectiveness as a product of collective cognition comes from the data used in this paper. Originally, the data had been analyzed following a framework derived from more traditional and "mainstream" leadership research such as Warren Bennis and John Gardner (Amey, 1989; Amey, 1990). According to the prior analyses, the provost referred to as Provost D in this paper was not found to be exhibiting very significant leadership behaviors as identified in the leadership framework. The conclusion focused mainly on

the lack of fit of the provost and what was perceived as her unwillingness to respond to the needs of constituents: "Given the present circumstances of the environment, the historical perspective of this position, the style and personal characteristics of the provost, this may be the wrong person to be serving at this institution" (Amey, 1989) In analyzing the same data using the constructive/ developmental theory, a different viewpoint came to light. While to some, Provost D is still seen as ineffective, the reasons for the perceptions and therefore, the strategies for **changing** the perceptions were quite different. The earlier research focused more on the existence of certain characteristics, behaviors and organizational structural considerations to determine effectiveness. The present study looked at **how** meaning was constructed within the organization by the leader and the constituents. As a result of this new perspective, what came to the surface was neither a provost choosing not to lead or one who was unable to lead constituents at College D, but rather a provost who was actually utilizing a variety of leadership strategies, some of which were more effective (and perceived as such) than others.

The constructive/developmental model provides far more useful information and feedback to the leader for enhancing leadership effectiveness than many traditional leadership research perspectives because it demonstrates leader/constituent cognitive congruence and incongruence on a wide range of issues including leader initiatives, organizational values, group needs, and the role of interpersonal relationships. In the case of Provost D, who is cognitively able to understand and utilize a broad range of leadership strategies, a lot could be gained by taking another look at both how her efforts are perceived and why. Recognizing not only the level of cognitive development of her constituents but what combination of leadership strategies will be required to achieve buy-in, motivation, organizational growth, and cognitive development, could be instrumental to enhancing Provost D's overall leadership effectiveness.

CONCLUSION

This study has important implications for the study of leadership and organizational change. The research offers a different perspective on the study of leadership and leadership

effectiveness, which in itself is important to expanding our understanding of these complex phenomena. The constructive/developmental model and leadership continuum posited here offer new insights into why some leaders may be seen as effective in their organizations and others are not. The research also provides an avenue for understanding the options available to leaders given their own development and the development of their organization, although at this juncture, the theory seems most useful as a research tool and feedback mechanism. Its applicability and utility for the leader-practitioner is largely dependent on one's own cognitive development. Further research would need to be conducted in this area.

While we have long studied the development of organizations, we have been less willing to incorporate the development of leaders into these analyses or to recognize the interplay which might exist between leader and organizational development. If one adheres to the tenets of constructive/developmental theory, then it is important to more fully understand how leaders structure, perceive and are developmentally able to construct meaning in order to accurately assess leader impact as instruments of organizational change.

REFERENCES

Amey, M.J. *Academic Vice Presidents in Action: An Analysis of Four Areas of Leadership Competency*. Unpublished dissertation. The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, 1989.

Amey, M.J. *"Number One Staffer" or "Number Two Leader of the Institution": Clarifying Expectations and Realities of the Role of Chief Academic Officers*. Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Assocation for the Study of Higher Education, 1990.

Bass, B.M. *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press, 1985.

Bensimon, E.M. Transactional, Transformational and "Trans-vigorational" Leaders. *Leadership Abstracts* 1989,2 6.

Bensimon, E.M., Neumann, A., and Birnbaum, R. *Making Sense of Administrative Leadership: The "L" Word in Higher Education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University, 1989.

Burns, J.M. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row, 1978.

Heider, J. The Leader Who Knows How Things Happen. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology* 1982 27*(3)*, 33-39.

Hollander, E.P. Social Psychological Perspectives on Leadership. *Liberal Education* 1987 *73* (2), 9-15.

Kegan, R. *The Evolving Self: Problem and Process in Human Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Kegan, R. and Lahey, L.L. Adult Leadership and Adult Development: A Constructivist View. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), *Leadership: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984.

Kellerman, B. *Leadership: Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984.

Kelley, R.E. In Praise of Followers. In W.E. Rosenbach and R.L. Taylor (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Leadership* 2nd edition. Boulder: Westview Press, 1989.

Kohlberg, L. Stages of Moral Development. In C.M. Beck, B.S. Crittenden, and E.V. Sullivan (Eds.), *Moral Education*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

Kuhnert, K.W. and Lewis, P. Transactional and Transformational Leadership: A Constructive/Developmental Analysis. *The Academy of Management Review* 1987 *12* (4), 648-657.

Morgan, G. *Images of Organizations*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1986.

Perry, W.G.Jr. *Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Piaget, J. Cognitive Development in Children. In R. Ripple and V. Rockcastle (Eds.), *Piaget Rediscovered: A Report on Cognitive Studies in Curriculum Development.* Ithica, NY: Cornell University School of Education, 1964.

Rodgers, R.F. Theories Underlying Student Development. In D.G. Creamer (Ed.), *Student Development in Higher Education.* American College Personnel Association, 1980.

Smircich, L. and Morgan, G. Leadership: The Management of Meaning. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences* 1982 *18* (3), 257-274.

Smith, A.F. Lawrence Kohlberg's Cognitive Stage Theory of the Development of Moral Judgment. In L. Knefelkamp, C. Widick, and C.A. Parker (Eds.), *Applying New Developmental Findings.* New Directions for Student Services No. 4. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Yukl, G.A. *Leadership in Organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1984.